

VANGUARD

A LIBERTARIAN COMMUNIST JOURNAL

ERUEL-Taken By CNT-FAI



Fascism and
Brazil

•
Science & Society

•
People's Front in France

•
RUSSOMANIA

ANARCHIST TACTICS IN SPAIN
An Answer To The Trotzkyites

FEB. 1938
VOL. 4, No. 2

10¢

EDITORIALS

THE SHELL OF SOCIALISM— The Russian Perversion in Practice

THE twentieth anniversary of the October Revolution was marked by a wholesale slaughter of its most outstanding figures, by monstrous frame-ups and by a grotesque mockery of the basic principles of democracy displayed by the so-called Stalinist elections.

More than a thousand people were executed without even a semblance of trial, and among them—men like Bukharin and Rakovsky,* whose lives were an open book to the world at large and whose revolutionary past renders the monstrous accusations of complicity in fascist plots as horrid a fabrication as any that marred the pages of human history.

And back of those mass executions, arrests and physical extermination of the active membership of the Communist Party there was revealed to the world a ruthless drive for a personal dictatorship, stark and naked in its undisguised lust for absolute power. The twentieth anniversary of the greatest revolution of our time which was to abolish classes, whose avowed aim was the disappearance of the state and the realization of a socialist society of free and equal men, finds the country in the grip of a terroristic regime which has thrown off all restraints of humanity in the pursuance of personal ambitions and self-aggrandizement on the part of its leading figure.

The world stands aghast at this outburst of savagery, which reads more like a medieval chronicle than a chapter in socialist reconstruction. And it is appalled even more so by the fact that those monstrous political crimes are committed in the name of socialism, in the name of a great humanitarian ideal for which generations of men fought and bled.

Is this socialism, the world asks itself. Yes and no, we say.

Yes, it is socialism, but not the kind which was envisioned by the best minds of the civilized world. It is socialism of the opposite kind: the nightmare which haunted the advanced social thinkers of the world, the travesty of the real socialism with which the enemies of the latter taunted its protagonists for a number of years.

It is a socialism which is built upon the negation of freedom, the negation of human values without which it becomes a mere shell of the great ideal which inspired more than two generations of men and women in their heroic struggle for a better society. Against this sort of "socialism" the best minds of the socialist movement, from its very inception, raised their voices of prophetic warning.

* Ed. Note: *The execution of Bukharin, Rykov and Rakovsky has not been officially revealed, but there is a great deal of indirect evidence which seems to give credence to the persistent rumors of such executions. And, as is known, the escaped diplomat Barmine stated openly that these executions did take place.*

True socialism, they said, cannot be realized by completely wiping off the complex system of individual rights which humanity built up on the basis of its rich, historic experience. The fact that until now those rights were woven around the institution of private property and a competitive sort of economy does not make them invalid as such. They have to be re-interpreted, re-oriented, given a new content and social form, but they cannot be dismissed as something of transient value, of passing significance, to be dispensed with in the initial period of building up a new society.

This period, they said, must lay the cornerstone of a new freedom, but it cannot reject freedom as such. And
(Continued on page six)

Money Talks

Since the inception of the left Popular Front government in 1936, France has been undergoing a remarkable series of right changes. Riding into power on the backs of 5,000,000 workers engaged in a bitter and successful offensive against French capitalism, the "left" regime, since converted to militarism and patriotism, seems to be on the verge of being pushed out by the real rulers of France whom they served so well during the crisis. Militant working-class action has given way to militant polemics—on "national unity," rehabilitation of the franc, rearmament, etc.—by the politicians of the left political parties. The Popular Front is well on the way to becoming the French counterpart of the British Labor Party, and thus once more the anarchist position on the worth of working-class parliamentarism is borne out.

It isn't just the Moscow line pursued by the Popular Front which emasculates a policy of militancy. Much to its chagrin, the "Two Hundred Families" of France still run the country and through their representative Bonnet, finance minister, at whose mercy the Popular Front always remained, keep the Red Dancers in tune with the whistles of Citroen, Renault, etc.

The "progressive" Roosevelt, equipped with a popular mandate to attack the economic royalists of America, also seems to have his "family" troubles. The "Sixty Families" are doing as well as their French cousins in tempering the vivacious mood of our smiling F. D. Amid conflicting reports about balancing the budget and extending more relief, fighting the trusts and making peace with the industrialists, the conservative fingers of finance keep whittling away at the Roosevelt program of economic stability for the masses. It looks as if our President will achieve greater success in relieving the distress of the "Sixty Families" than he did for his "forgotten man."

The time approaches when American labor will have to take a more active role and strike out at an independent policy; not a parliamentary policy pursued by its present leadership in imitation of the British and French labor unions. They must take the road upon which their present leaders cannot and will not take them, the road leading to industrial control by the unions.

vanguard

Published by the Vanguard Group, 45 W. 17th St., New York City. Subscription in U. S., one dollar (\$1.00) a year (12 issues). Foreign \$1.25. Single copies 10 cts.

Volume 4, Number 2

February, 1938

Anarchist Tactics in Spain

by SENEX

AN ANSWER TO THE NEW INTERNATIONAL

EVER since the 1931 revolution in Spain, the "strategists" of the Fourth International have been busy predicting the rapid disintegration and decay of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalist movement. Taken aback by the emergence into the revolutionary limelight of this powerful movement, built upon the negation of the basic Trotskyite dogma—the monopoly of revolutionary leadership by a political party—the leaders of the Fourth International met this living challenge by prophesying and passing judgments of doom and extinction.

"We must have no illusions about the fate of anarcho-syndicalism"—wrote the keynoter of this anti-anarchist campaign, Leon Trotsky, in 1931. "It may be assumed that a part of the syndicalist leaders will go over to the socialists or will be cast aside by the revolution. The real revolutionists will be with us: the masses will join the Communists." ("The Revolution in Spain.") The same prophecy is reiterated in his larger pamphlet dealing with the problem of the revolution of 1931 ("The Spanish Revolution in Danger") in which he writes that "There is every reason to calculate that the sorry bewilderment of the anarcho-syndicalists will push the workers further toward the Communists and that the Party will have sufficient time to prepare itself and to lead the proletariat to victory."

So confident was Trotsky of his predictions that with the exception of those few sentences summarily disposing of the fate of the anarcho-syndicalist movement in terms of rather obvious wishful thinking, he devotes hardly any space and attention to the question of the probable role of this powerful revolutionary movement in the coming events. In his analysis of the various factors instrumental in bringing about the predicted second revolution, Trotsky managed to ignore altogether the C.N.T.-F.A.I., that is, a revolutionary force which, in view of the generally admitted weakness of the Communist Party and the ultra-reformist line pursued by the Socialist Party, was already the greatest *single* factor in mobilizing

the gathering revolutionary energies of the Spanish proletariat for an attack upon the bourgeois republic.

Old Prophecies in a New Guise

The growing militancy of those attacks against the Republic soon silenced the prophets of reformist degeneration of the anarcho-syndicalist movement. Only a few months after such prophecies had been uttered, the C.N.T.-F.A.I. was already heading the great historic mass movements of 1932-33 which are now recognized by every student of Spanish life as landmarks on the road toward the revolution of July 19th.

It was plainly too ridiculous to keep up the silly predictions of the reformist degeneration of the C.N.T. in face of the great struggles waged by its militants all over the country. And so the line of attack was shifted from charges of reformism, waged against the C.N.T. in the first months of the revolution of 1931, to those of putchism, adventurism, revolutionary irresponsibility, etc. The arguments differed in character, but the starting point remained the same: the revolutionary vigor of the Spanish anarcho-syndicalist movement was an historic paradox of passing and purely local significance. The course of revolutionary struggles will bring back the state of "normalcy": the C.N.T.-F.A.I. which lacked the "scientific program of revolutionary Marxism" as interpreted by Trotsky and his disciples, will dissolve under the impact of revolutionary events, giving place to a true vanguard of the "elect," that is, those that have fully adopted the "scientifically tested line" of the Fourth International.

All during the revolutionary struggles of 1931-1936 the Trotskyists were eagerly scanning the horizons of turbulent Spanish life for the slightest sign of the disintegration of the C.N.T. Every defeat suffered by the revolutionary forces was magnified by their press, maliciously commented upon and held up as a portent of the inevitable bankruptcy of the anarchist movement. The

latter, according to our self-styled "revolutionary strategists," was heading toward bankruptcy in 1932 (that is, after the savage suppression of the revolutionary movements in Catalonia and Andalucia), it was sure to disintegrate after the revolts of 1933, and, as the local Trotskyite paper gleefully reported in 1935, the C.N.T. was rapidly dwindling in importance as a result of its utter inability to adapt itself to conditions of semi-legal existence imposed upon it by the semi-fascist regime of Gil Robles-Leroux.

Who Was Bankrupt on the Eve of July 19?

How well those predictions stood the supreme historic test afforded by the revolution of July 19 is now known to every one who paid sufficient attention to the newspaper reports on those events. The leading role played by the C.N.T.-F.A.I. was, of course, a source of perplexity and amazement to every Marxist, but it certainly did not spring miraculously from a state of decadence and disintegration: *it was the climax of a cumulative process of revolutionary growth, which was entirely misrepresented by the leaders of the Fourth International for purely partisan purposes.*

We can judge the nature of this distortion the better if we take into account the fact that while the C.N.T.-F.A.I. were held up to derision as organizations heading toward bankruptcy, the Communist forces were undergoing a process of successive splits and divisions which brought them to the position of a negligible factor in the revolutionary events of July 19. The official Communist Party as is known, had to be "reborn" in order to achieve its present position: that is, it was organized upon a different social basis—primarily that of the middle class with semi-fascist leanings—and was hoisted into power by the powerful arm of the Soviet government.

And as to the Trotskyites proper, they dwindled to the size of an insignificant little sect, abandoned by every outstanding man in the Spanish movement (the case of Andreas Nin, the ex-secretary of Trotsky and leader of the Communist Opposition of Spain, is the most striking illustration of this revolt against sectarianism) and petrified in its attitude of self-righteousness and sterile, doctrinaire criticisms.

A Bare Scheme in Place of a Concrete Analysis

A good example of this attitude is the recent "blast" directed at the Spanish anarchist movement from the pages of the theoretical organ of the American Trotskyites, "The New International." The article ("Anarchism in Spain" by Felix Morrow), purporting to be a "critical" evaluation of the tactics pursued by the Spanish anarchist movement, adds very little to the stock arguments advanced against the anarchist movement in the past. It adds very little to the understanding of the complicated and tragic situation with which the Spanish anarchists were faced. But it throws a revealing light upon the mental processes of the sectarian mind, to which a few

glib deductions from dogmatic premises and a left-handed attempt to fit those deductions to a crude semblance of reality, suffice to pass withering judgments, in a self-assumed pontifical capacity, upon a movement of great revolutionary vitality and creative vigor.

What makes this article representative of the sectarian approach is not, of course, the sharp condemnation, unrestrained language ("the crimes" of the C.N.T.), and the lack of understanding of the basic aims of the anarcho-syndicalist policy in Spain. The Marxists are entitled to their biases and historic perspectives in their evaluation of the anarchist tactics. And were such evaluations undertaken on the basis of a full estimation of all the factors that went into the making of the difficult situation with which the Spanish anarchists had to cope, it would be welcomed by everyone of us regardless of its conclusions and its biased approaches. But what value can there be to a bare scheme, built up in order to "prove" to the satisfaction of the indoctrinated readers of "The New International" that their puerile analysis of the historic role of the anarchist movement has been borne out once more by the test of large scale events?

For it is a bare construction that Mr. Morrow presents us with in his article and not a concrete analysis of the political situation in Spain. Why didn't the C.N.T. take power in July, Mr. Morrow asks. One would expect some sort of an analysis of the situation in order to answer this crucial question. But so eager was Mr. Morrow to prove his foregone conclusion about the inevitable bankruptcy of the anarchist movement that to answer this crucial question he needed only a bare quotation from a small pamphlet.

How Strong Was the C.N.T.?

Was the C.N.T. strong enough to take power? Yes, answers Morrow. The proof—a few sentences written *en passant* by Rocker in his pamphlet "The Tragedy of Spain" and referring only to the situation in Catalonia. But why should Felix Morrow, who considers himself competent enough to write books and pamphlets on the Spanish situation, have to fall back upon a chance quotation as his sole prop in order to prove this focal point of his argument? Because any attempt on his part to analyse the situation on the basis of original sources would have revealed a number of limiting factors which would have clearly shown the doctrinaire character of his animadversions.

Was the C.N.T. strong enough in the central province of Spain? (Castille.) Anyone conversant with the situation knows that its strength in Madrid and its provinces was not that of a predominant factor. The C.N.T.-F.A.I. has grown prodigiously in that part of Spain ever since July 19. But prior to that time those organizations were distinctly a minority within the labor and peasant movements of that province. Madrid, however, was not just one of the Spanish cities: it was the

(Continued on page thirteen)

Science and Society

By LISTON M. OAK

THE American Association for the Advancement of Science and its British counterpart have founded an international "Parliament of Science." Its purpose is stated to be to turn the brilliant light of scientifically trained intelligence upon the world's social problems, to offer guidance to the people, and to see that intellectual freedom does not perish from the earth.

This Parliament of Science has recently held its second session. Numerous prominent scientists stressed the fact that science has a splendid record of success in solving problems in every field except politics and economics. The social sciences have not kept pace with physics, medicine, technology, chemistry, etc. Scientists have created a new environment for man; they have made possible the increase of man's productive powers a thousand-fold; they have lengthened his life-span by 60 per cent; they have penetrated into the secrets of the atom and of inter-stellar space. Scientists have made possible a society of abundance. But they have not discovered any way to solve the problem of unemployment. They have made the weapons of war destructive beyond the dreams of Napoleon or Caesar; but they can't tell us how to prevent war.

The vast experience that we have had in the past two decades alone should provide us with a basis for certain generalizations, certain obvious lessons, that would serve to guide us in our future action; experience that should enable us to avoid the tragedy of another war, another economic crisis, to go forward toward a solution of our political and economic problems so that all mankind could benefit to the maximum from the great advance made by scientists.

To be more specific, the experiences of the masses in Russia, Germany, Italy, Austria, and Spain ought to teach us certain fundamental lessons so that we can avoid the disastrous consequences of Stalinism and Fascism, the mistakes of social democracy and class collaboration. If we were to apply to the historical record the objective, searching analytical method of the physicist, ready to check our ideas against experience, to discard or modify our formulas as they proved erroneous, eager to profit by experience, to reason, to generalize, with the maximum flexibility, then indeed the tragic suffering through which the workers of these countries have gone would not be in vain.

But the world moves toward more wars, toward totalitarian dictatorships, toward another terrible depression bringing unemployment and misery, much more rapidly than the world moves toward reawakening and reorganization on a more intelligent, scientific basis. Mankind, and particularly the workers, seems incapable of learning fast enough; it hasn't sufficient intelligence to avoid these calamities. This applies with special force to the intellectual workers, the scientists. Despite their

grand pretensions, expressed in this "Parliament of Science," actually the scientists are pathetic, futile, and confused. Their contributions to the solution of social problems are of relatively insignificant value.

Like the capitalist (and Stalinist and Social Democratic) politicians, the economists and other bourgeois scientists fill the daily papers with scholarly nonsense, demagoguery; when a famous chemist discusses economics he is as infantile as a Southern Senator, though he clothes his mouthings in five-dollar words. Learned scientists reflect the popular prejudices and misconceptions inculcated by the press, radio, church, schools, controlled by America's sixty billionaire families. The worthy scientists are as helpless as Roosevelt's brain trust when they try to find ways of ending the recurrent business cycle; capitalist society moves inexorably along its path strewn with human victims, despite all the reforms that the New Deal politicians or the scientists can devise. *None of them dare deal scientifically with these basic problems of capitalist society in decline.*

Scientists do not function in a vacuum. They serve the ruling class first and mankind only secondarily. There is not one scientific institution, not one educational institution, of any significant size, that is not completely dependent upon donations from capitalists. Scientists are employees of the wealthy dictators of "democratic" America. They can discover new cures for cancer, they can develop new technological processes, they can dig up archaeological facts, they can build up revolutionary theories of physics—but they cannot discover new cures for social ills, they cannot develop a new technique for social change, they cannot dig up facts explaining why there is war and fascism, they cannot revolutionize society, without jeopardizing their jobs, their prestige, their power.

The Movies have recently dramatized the tremendous resistance which Pasteur had to overcome; and the contempt accorded Zola in his fight for justice for Dreyfus. But the resistant and social pressure encountered by Pasteur and Zola and others like them is nothing compared to the resistance and social pressure against which a scientist must fight if he advocates revolutionary social ideas. Truth that revolutionizes medical ideas is acceptable, but truth that would revolutionize social relationships—that is verboten. In totalitarian lands the penalty is death or exile; in "democratic" countries the penalty is often social disapproval and ostracism, loss of prestige and of livelihood, and at worst, imprisonment. The academic freedom of the scientist is relative—never absolute. If a scientist wants success, power, wealth, prestige, honor, all the rewards of capitalist society, he must please his masters; he can be a conservative or a liberal in politics, but he cannot be a revolutionist, unless he values truth and intellectual integrity above all the

other rewards—and damn few do. The majority succumb.

Today the scientists, like all the rest of us who do socially useful labor, are faced with the threat of Fascism which would rob them of the few democratic liberties they possess. Scientists cannot ignore the fact that in Germany and Italy—and even in Russia, it must be admitted—there is a political, cultural and scientific reaction; in alarm, American and British scientists align themselves with the liberal anti-Fascist movement. In doing so, they make all the mistakes that other liberals, reformists and opportunists make—many of them favor “collective security” which means war of the “have” against the “have-not” Fascist powers, one group of imperialist nations against another less fortunate group. The scientists favor the maintenance of democracy, unscientifically ignoring the fact that the decline of capitalism, recurrent economic crises, wars, will bring fascism everywhere unless capitalism is overthrown. They favor reforms that experience in Germany and elsewhere has proven futile, and reject the revolutionary program that alone could forever free science from its shackles.

Despite its absurdities, there was a large germ of truth in the ideas of the “Technocrats.” The administration of affairs, of things, as opposed to the oppression of men, will be in the hands of scientifically trained workers after the revolution. With political and economic power held by workers of hand and brain, the scientists can really serve mankind, and science will become the possession of all society, a powerful weapon against poverty, disease, and ignorance.

Let the “Parliament of Science” tell the scientific truth; let it denounce capitalism and ally itself with the revolutionary proletariat, if it would realize its ambition to “guide the destinies of man”!

ED. NOTE: *Comrade Oak, we believe, minimizes somewhat the potential significance of the attempts made to rally the scientific world against the immediate threats held out by totalitarianism in its various forms.*

True, the scientists are subject to the terrific pressure of economic and political interests which are responsible for the totalitarian drives upon the basic values of our culture. But the only way for them to resist effectively such pressure, or even to become aware of the social implications thereof, is to ORGANIZE ALONG THEIR OWN PROFESSIONAL LINES. For it is the lack of organization coming as a result of the prevalence of the nineteenth century attitude—that of the middle class atomistic individualism, which somehow lingered with the scientists longer than with other groups—that is mainly responsible for the social impotence of the scientific world.

Mere adoption of the credo of the revolutionary proletariat cannot take the place of self-assertion of the scientific world along organizational lines. There are certain cultural values of which the scientists are more sensitive than other groups. The defense of those values along libertarian lines will be necessary even in a society where “political and economic power” will lie in the hands of revolutionary workers.

EDITORIALS

(Continued from page two)

in order to make possible the building up of a new freedom, it must take as its starting point the dispersion of political power and not its highest concentration at one uncontrolled, unrestrained source. Not totalitarianism or political absolutism should be the political form of this initial period, but a new federalism, a new equilibrium between individual and social rights, between the power of the community as a whole, its various organic units and the individual as the source of all delegated power.

It was the greatest tragedy of the socialists that the first attempt of its realization was made in a country that knew less of those advanced ideas of socialism than any of the great western democracies which were expected to be the first in initiating socialism. The latter was known in Russia in its crudest form—that of its barest economic content, stripped of its political and ethical aspects which impart to socialism its distinct character and make it the greatest ideal of our times.

This crude conception of socialism found its full expression in the ideological force molding the October revolution in its crucial period. Marxism-Leninism, with its a-moralism in revolutionary matters, with its retrograde ideas of political leadership, was the main ideological force twisting the October revolution into its present abject shape. It is the reactionary Leninist idea of the rule by the so-called “vanguard,” by a revolutionary minority organized along the lines of a military order—the resurrected ideal of all reactionaries, the absolute rule by the “philosopher-king,”—that is mainly responsible for the degradation of the October revolution, now reaching its low depths in the monstrous frame-ups and revilement of elementary precepts of justice.

This degradation is not a thing of today only. It began simultaneously with the first steps of the new regime. It was inherent in all the basic measures taken by the new government. It was manifest in the manner in which the accumulated safeguards of individual freedom were swept away to make room for the despotic power of the state. It found its expression in the enthronement of lynch law, as discharged by the extraordinary Commissions (Che-ka), in place of the judicial equity of Popular Courts. And it was a degraded and perverted socialism that arose on the ruins of a revolutionary democracy, broken up and demolished in order to make room for a party dictatorship.

What we see now is the inexorable working out of this perverted idea of socialism in practice. The heinous political murders now shocking the conscience of the world are a necessary link in the unfolding of the great drama which began twenty years ago with the tragic divorce between ends and means, between form and content, between the libertarian aspirations of a great socialist revolution and the dictatorial mold in which they were cast by the triumphant Leninist Party

S—X.

A. F. L. - C. I. O. - WHAT NOW?

By JOSEPH Z. CORN

We are presenting this interesting article to our readers, although we differ with the author in the evaluation of the role of the unions in general and the C.I.O.-A.F.L. negotiations in particular.

We do not consider these unions, corrupt as their leadership might be in many cases, as mere derivatives of the capitalist system. The C.I.O. does not owe its existence and riotous development to the exigencies of the nascent forces of state capitalism. Tremendous forces of mass upsurgency went into its making. True, those forces seem to be imprisoned by the present leadership. They are too inarticulate to find their own channel, which, logically cannot be but that of revolutionary syndicalism. But that does not detract from their potential strength in the events to come. Nor do we evaluate labor unions only from the point of view of their destructive effect upon the capitalist society. They are the cells of the future economic organism and no other organization—unions of unemployed or others—great as their role as auxiliaries might be, can take the place of labor unions.

IN the past months a number of factors have interwoven to press the issue of C.I.O.—A.F.L. unity. Trade union politics, which constitute a phase of capitalist politics in general, must be regarded from the standpoint of the present crisis in capitalist society. The division between the powerful union leaders has from the start been of advantage to large numbers of workers. Even if we assume that both factions do some exaggerating in the published estimates of their respective memberships, still it can be accepted that the combined total is over 5,000,000 an increase of 2,000,000 since the Lewis exit from the A.F.L. This increase may largely be explained by the fierce competition between the two camps which made it essential for both organizations to endorse the growing initiative of the masses instead of thwarting such spontaneous militancy as was customarily the case. Thus, it may be said, the division between the unions in the end served the cause of working-class unity—a paradoxical situation perhaps, but then capitalism tends to grow more contradictory as the crisis deepens.

The New Deal and the C.I.O.

With all the fanfare of the New Deal, and in spite of the fact that the Government as *collective capitalist* has taken over almost all initiative in economic matters, the recent upsurge in industrial activity lasted a trifle short of three and a half years. This governmental "intrference" will be further intensified as the present depression develops to a point even more critical than that reached in March 1933. Roosevelt favors a state-managed capitalism while the supporters of the moribund Liberty League desire to retain the old individualistic methods of exploitation.

The C.I.O. came on the scene at the peak of this conflict. Its function was to further Roosevelt's campaign against old-line capitalism. It was to play a "vanguard" role in pressing the government to fix wages, hours and prices—an attitude defined by Mr. Lewis in a recent article in *Public Opinion* as the present-day labor objectives. This concept of "planned economy" would mean the gradual entrance of the government into industrial control and ownership. It will be the task of the government to take over industry unable to exist privately in order to assure at least a low average of profit on the capital investment.

The battle between the two capitalist camps continues to rage. The New Deal has, therefore, encouraged the union struggle against the resisting private entrepreneurs. The company union is outlawed and the labor unions legally recognized as the lawful bargaining agencies. The C.I.O. served as the instrument to carry out this policy and, in many instances, it proved even more militant than the Roosevelt regime had contemplated. The unexpected sweep of the sit-down strike—an innovation of striking workers which soon necessitated union authorization—finally resulted in Roosevelt's much quoted curse: "A plague on both houses."

Now, Peace or Else—

With the re-election of Roosevelt, the tune of the Old Guard, seemed to change. U.S. Steel controlled, by the Morgan interests signed up with the C.I.O.; while the Rockefellers in an importunate letter to Mr. Farley also indicated that they knew in which direction the wind was blowing.

The Government spending program helped to restore capitalism to a semblance at least of its former profitability. And today, after four years, possibilities for profit have been exhausted. What can the government do? It is one thing to "prime the pump" from the lowest level and it is quite another thing to continue the flow of profits once these have gotten under way. This continuation requires purchasing power and today that is largely absent. Will the New Deal, so prematurely aged, be able to keep the masses from utter destitution without *forcing* the enormous productive apparatus into motion despite the immediate profit-hunger of the large individualistic capitalists? For that, Franklin Roosevelt will probably have to find a new big stick. It remains to be seen whether, in view of such considerations, capitalist democracy can long endure. Indications seem to point to the fact that it cannot—that capitalism, internationally, can no longer afford democracy.

More Regimentation

It may be that a world war will solve these problems temporarily. To carry on a war, however, a "unified" labor movement is absolutely essential. War is, of course, another crisis and it would be highly fallacious to assume that it could tolerate two labor federations egging the masses on in competition for their favors. Thus the present division in the ranks of organized labor runs counter to the decisive trends in capitalistic society which now demands a "unified," centralized, well-controlled labor movement or—none at all. State capitalism has the double task of suppressing working class militancy and subduing the recalcitrant capitalists. For these purposes it will utilize the services of the "labor lieutenants" but to be effective these lieutenants must not be in a position where they compete with each other. They are required instead, to be unified, centralized and in full control of the situation.

Thus, in perspective, it may be predicted that Green's A.F.L. and the C.I.O. of John L. Lewis are bound to combine as soon as the fight between the individualistic capitalists and the Rooseveltian supporters is resolved on a New Deal basis. Thus the outcome of the controversy over the general policies to be pursued in the face of economic crisis will largely determine the issue of unity.

The Unions of Economic Crisis

The prosperity of trade unions is inexplicably interwoven with capitalist prosperity, for it is only during such periods of prosperity that the unions can serve to get higher wages and shorter hours. But if, out of ten years, only four may be said to be years of capitalist upswing, it is clear that the workers will find the unions of increasing uselessness. No jobs—no dues—that is the general rule in the growth and decline of free unionism.

Consequently, in such critical periods the unions are obliged to enter politics on a vast scale and function as the organizations of the unemployed; otherwise they must collapse. Such unions, led politically by men of the calibre of Roosevelt, Lewis and Hillman, together with the organized farmers and middle classes, may well become powerful weapons in the drive for state capitalism. But they will have to make haste, for the masses in this crisis lack the reserves which they had accumulated prior to 1929. Six more months of crisis, without abatement, and they will be capable of dangerous militancy directed against the very roots of capitalistic society. The "labor lieutenants" can view such development only with trepidation.

In such a period of crisis, division among the labor leaders will result in a rapid depletion in the already hard-hit union treasuries; the workers will find it to their interests to utilize the conflict in movements definitely handicapping depressed capitalism. The broader class interests of capitalism must therefore prevail over the quarrels of the labor spokesmen, debating union jurisdiction. So, despite the continuance of the controversy between old-line capitalism and New Deal capitalism, it may be that unity will be effected between the C.I.O. and A.F.L. soon.

That this will be unity in the interests of capitalism and not in the interests of the workingclass must be the conclusion of anyone who has investigated the facts behind the deceptive appearances. It is not the first time that the workers will learn that the justifying phrases are far rosier than the reality.

Labor in Action

WEST COAST

On the West Coast the fight for control of the unions has ended with a smashing victory for the rank and file membership. Harry Bridges, the C.P. stooge and tool of the C.I.O., has failed to force the workers into the C.I.O. The campaign of slander and falsification against the Sailors Union of the Pacific (S.U.P.) and Harry Lundeberg, its secretary, has only served to strengthen the conviction of the members that the C.I.O. and their allies, the C.P., must be repudiated. The S.U.P. has voted against joining either the C.I.O. or the A.F.L. To the astonishment and mortification of the Communists and the C.I.O. the Marine Firemen's Union has just voted out its Communist officials in San Francisco.

This victory is of tremendous importance and is bound to have deep repercussions on the Marine set-up on the East Coast as well as on the Pacific. It will undermine the C.P. influence in the N.M.U. It is a living example to the marine workers that they can have clean and militant unionism without the C.I.O. The C.I.O. is being discredited, its true nature is becoming manifest to the rank and file of the workers. It also provides a splendid opportunity for the I.W.W. to extend and deepen the revolutionary capacities of the membership of these unions by continuing to set the example of how a really conscious democratic and class-conscious union should conduct

itself. The VANGUARD extends congratulations to the S.U.P. and the Firemen for their good sense and militancy.

The Rank and File are opening their eyes. They perceive the true nature of the A.F.L. and the C.I.O. To quote a famous American, they say "A plague on both houses," and go forward in the fight for solidarity, militancy and democratic control. If this tendency is fostered by the conscious revolutionists in the labor movement, it will result in a victory for revolutionary unionism.

EAST COAST

In the elections that recently took place on the Atlantic and Gulf coast to determine who is to represent the Seamen. The National Maritime Union (N.M.U.) was chosen. The Union now possesses a strength of 52,000 members. The new constitution which was recently adopted by a referendum vote of the membership, provides for the election of all officers by November 1938. Despite this the leaders of the N.M.U. are calling for an immediate election. This appears very strange, but the reasons for this are not hard to find.

The fact of the matter is that the majority of the district committee, the agents and delegates and other officials are members of the Communist party. The organ of the N.M.U. the Pilot is controlled by the Communists. The 52,000 members are paying 52,000 dollars a month into the treasury of the union. A nice juicy plum.

The C.I.O. and the Communist leadership are being attacked by an ever increasing number of dissatisfied rank and file workers. The seamen are sick and tired of seeing their dues frittered away by lawyers, agents and petty racketeers all of whom are connected with the party. They are tired of the continual calls upon the membership to "march to Washington," to write to your congressmen, while Higher wages better conditions, shorter hours are sidetracked.

The growing discontent with the leadership of the Communists threatens to overwhelm them. They know that they will lose their jobs if they wait for the election in November. At present the agents and organizers and officials are in a position to force a vote favorable to themselves. This is why they are so anxious to have an election now. Of course this maneuver is camouflaged by the Stalinists as proof of the great "Democracy" which is part of their stock in trade.

AUTO UNIONS

The most significant development in recent labor history is the revolt of the rank and file against the dictatorship of the C.I.O. leadership. The revolts are taking place in many unions, primarily in the United Automobile Workers of America (U.A.W.A.).

Lester Washburn, president of local 182, was ordered to STAY AWAY from the meetings by the membership of the Fisher Body branch. Both he and Homer Martin were guilty of establishing a dictatorship, in place of the democratic shop steward system.

The Flint local refused to accept the dictatorship of the Martin machine. The local was disbanded, and reorganized as five separate locals with five separate officialdoms, appointed by Martin, and pledged to follow his instructions. The principle of "Divide and Rule" was followed out in order to prevent the opposition from functioning as a single unit in a single local.

In the locals in and around Detroit, 100 officials were replaced with a 100 hand picked "yes" men, responsible only to Martin, who is in turn accountable only to "Il Duce" Lewis.

THE ROLE OF THE LOVESTONITES

The sit-down strike which took place at Pontiac involved 400 workers. They struck against the lay-offs, the speed-up and against discrimination of good union men. The strike was a great success, and promised to spread throughout the industry. The strike was also necessary because the union officials could not remedy these conditions and the workers resorted to direct action to accomplish their aims. The Strike was declared "illegal." It endangered the sacred contract. The leaders were going to show the bosses that THEY control the union, and that they are respectable and responsible. They were determined to break the strike.

The followers of Martin which included the Lovestonites, prevailed upon the strikers to hold the plant in four shifts, on the pretext that it would give them a chance to spend their leisure time at home. The unsuspecting workers agreed.

One of these shifts were packed with a majority of Martin Lovestone sympathizers, L. B. Netzger a young lawyer employed by the union was called by telephone to appear at the plant. He was allowed to enter and succeeded in convincing the workers to allow Martin to address them. (Martin was previously prohibited from entering the plant on pain of physical punishment.) He got the workers to evacuate the plant, the protest of the sincere minority notwithstanding, 40 stooges left the plant to the Company guards. The remaining 400 workers found themselves locked out, betrayed by the Lovestone fakers and their masters, the Martin machine.

Martin was praised by the reactionary press. He invoked vengeance on the active strikers. The rights of the membership of the Pontiac Local were suspended. A dictator rules with and iron hand. The "honor" and "integrity" of the C.I.O. have been saved.

SAM WEINER

Anti-Lewis Miners Framed

The case of the Illinois miners related in this communication is tragic like that of labor militants caught in the net of capitalist justice.

But still more tragic is the degeneration of a union which owes its origin to forces of mass revolt and a genuine search for a progressive, democratic type of unionism. That this should end up in the control of Coughlinites, Ku-Kluxers and other fascist elements points to some ominous miscarriage of a promising rebellion in the ranks of an important labor organization.

In one of the following issues of the "Vanguard" we hope to present our readers with the story of this frustrated revolt told by one of the active figures in the struggle of Illinois miners.

—The Editors

THIRTY-SIX members of the Progressive Miners of America, an A. F. L. affiliate, were found guilty at Springfield, Ill., Dec. 18, by a Federal jury of Central Illinois farmers and tradesmen. The latest victims of capitalist injustice were charged with interfering with the mails and violation of interstate commerce laws attributed to the violence committed during forty-five railroad and mine bombings in the internecine mine war of 1932 to date.

An appeal has been granted to thirty-four. Basing its case on hearsay and perverted testimony, the government succeeded in convicting the coal diggers mainly because they were members of the Progressive union which at one time gave promise of liberating the American miners from the swamp of business unionism.

The government went to great lengths and expense to acquire its "victory". Witnesses were summoned from the Philippine Islands to testify against the miners. Agents pro-

vacateurs, spies,—in all, more than a hundred shady, mercenary persons were paraded before the jury to spew forth a disconnected story of lies and exaggerations in the effort to obtain a conviction. Even then the government has yet to name a single bomber, identify a single bomb and directly show how, where, and when. As proven at the trial, the miners were guilty before they were ever tried.

The trial was a virtual review of the Illinois mine war. More than fifty people have been killed in the bitter controversy between warring factions for supremacy in the Illinois coal fields. Huge marches and picket lines had rallied tens of thousands of miners and their women to economic action. Military forces patrolled the coal towns for months in the service of the Peabody Coal Company. Thousands were arrested. The peaceful Illinois countryside was torn by scenes of civil war between domineering coal corporations and embattled miners who had been cheated of their pay and working conditions.

The Progressive Miners Union was formed in Sept., 1932, after the officers of the United Mine Workers of America, long exposed as corrupt and dishonest, had laid plans to force the second wage cut in four years. Union officials, known for their handsome salaries and smugness, but unknown for fighting the miners' cause, again asked that the miners accept a wage cut from \$6.10 to \$5.00 a day in 1932 after the miners had struck for six months without an inkling of a break within their ranks.

The coal miners had planted safeguards through the demand for a referendum on the proposed wage reduction and in the voting they roundly defeated their officers' usual plea that "Illinois had to take a cut or lose the miners union." The officers ordered another referendum and as usual the vote was negative. Before the vote could be officially tabulated, however, the crude maneuver was glaringly exposed—a union officer stole the tally sheets. Subsequently, an emergency was declared and the miners were ordered to return to work under a twenty percent wage reduction. The smoldering fires of mass discontent ignited into flames of revolt. The Illinois miners refused to be treated as vassals. They held their ground. Not a wheel turned in the Illinois coal industry until the companies began to defy the miners' strike with the blessings of union officers who had proposed at the expense of the miners.

Then followed the formation of the P.M.A. For five years the insurgent miners have battled against great odds and heart-breaking adversity. The combined front of the coal operators and state forces have won many battles, but they have yet to win the war because behind the Illinois coal diggers is a tradition of sixty years of union action and forty-seven years of union organization.

It must be pointed out too, as a matter of record, that this writer has often opposed most of the policies and tactics of the leadership of the Progressive Miners of America which these men, with one exception, invariably followed. This writer has often criticized the Progressive leadership for its red baiting, anti-semitism, and its war against radical elements within the organization. He feels that he would be lacking in revolutionary duty and integrity if he did not make this clear.

Notwithstanding these political reservations, the case of the thirty-six miners is the case of the American working class. These men have been framed beyond a doubt. They are the victims of the class war which knows no conventions or rules. This conviction without the voice of protest of the forces of liberty and justice sets a dangerous precedent for those who in the future will carry on the struggle for economic and social freedom.

A COAL MINER

Brazil's new constitution, proclaimed in November 1937 following President Getulio Vargas' coup d'etat, brought forth a flood of dissertations about the growing power of fascism in South America, and particularly in Brazil. The question was on everybody's mind whether the Eurasian "anti-communist" bloc of Germany, Italy and Japan will now be joined by the second largest country in the American hemisphere.

It almost seems as if all writers on political problems had forgotten that there have been in existence dictatorships and all forms of arbitrary repressions of liberal and labor movements, and suppressions of every form of civil liberty long before the word fascism became known in the world, long before Mussolini dug out that word from the forgotten "fasci" (unions or bundles) of the striking sulphur miners of Sicily more than forty years ago.

Wherever now a government or a ruler throws overboard the more or less democratic paper constitution of the country, disregards an inconvenient parliamentary majority, and rules without parliament or with a House of "Representatives" representing only the dictator or the ruling party which picked or appointed all candidates, the label "fascism" is immediately applied. A few years ago the Stalinists everywhere called "social-fascists" or even plain fascists every socialist local administration on the ground that it once may have used the police to disperse a demonstration or repress a strike.

Thus "fascism" became synonymous with repression—unless, of course the repression is applied with Marxist or Bolshevik slogans in the "fatherland of the workers" ruled by comrade Stalin, the infinitely beloved leader, friend and teacher of the working people throughout the world . . . who stands on guard over socialism, peace and liberty of all peoples" *)

In almost uninterrupted dictatorial rule of generals in South America, who followed each other by the various "pronunciamientos," a few breaks occurred during the second and third decade of this century. Liberal revolts or threats of revolts brought about for short periods more or less democratic or constitutional regimes in Argentina, Chile, Columbia and Uruguay. Brazil, which for many decades was ruled by a one-party dictatorship of the conservative "Republican Party" since the overthrow of the monarchy in 1889, had a short period of constitutional parliamentarism after a "liberal" military revolt in 1930 led by Getulio Vargas. It is the same Vargas who now, in order to perpetuate himself in unrestrained power, announced the new authoritarian constitution, in which he incorporated a few fascist slogans and methods, to make it appear a little more modern than the usual old time "pronunciamientos" of generals riding into power. Justifying his overriding the constitution, which he himself had framed, by the revelation that he had saved the country from the "threat of communism," he knew that he would have not only the sympathy of all fascist and dictatorial powers of the world, which are now in the majority, but even of most so-called liberal or democratic regimes, which hate "communism" or any popular regime even more than fascism.

But one of the main reasons of Vargas' coup d'etat was to forestall the growing power of the Brazilian Fascist movement, the "Integralistas," whose leader Plinio Salgado, was one of the candidates in the presidential election which Vargas cancelled by his coup.

The green-shirted *Acção Integralista Brasileira*, constitutes South America's largest fascist movement. Organized in 1932 by Plinio Salgado, its membership is variously estimated at from 200,000 to a million or more. Aside from its classical fascist terminology interspersed with anti-semitic catch-words nazi style (such as the proclamation to the Negro workers of Brazil: "You belong to the favored race, therefore it is your duty to fight the Jews who are members of the inferior races")—its specific Brazilian postulate is administrative centralization as against the present state federalism. They are also, and in this they emulate, at least verbally, various radical elements, very violent in denouncing Brazil's economic exploitation by foreign interests, by which however, only the British and American interests are meant. The leaders of the Integralistas claim having in its semi-military organizations a "foreign legion" consisting of 1000 Germans, Italians and Poles. One of their chief supports came from the numerous commercial and industrial German element that is very influential in a few states in the South. They expect to use the Integralista movement for the purpose of preventing Brazilian shipments to Germany's and Italy's enemies in the case of war. It was established that the party is largely financed with the aid of German and Italian money. It has a daily newspaper, several magazines and its own broadcasting station.

To prevent the success of the integralists, who had at their disposal armed forces trained by Italian and German fascist officers sent from abroad, Vargas had to act first in order to remain in power. He adopted their slogans and their methods . . . but used them also against the Integralists, his competitors for power.

He abolished the autonomy of the various states. This involved the disbanding of the state armies as these were often used in revolts against the federal armies and government. He prohibited all political parties—including the Integralistas and their semi-military organizations, in addition to the suppression of the liberty of the press, the dissolution of Congress and so on.

Vargas used the communist bogey to clamp down on the much greater menace against his power, that of the foreign subsidized Integralistas. As a dictator he had much at his command stronger and more rapid methods to suppress his competitors than a democracy has . . . which seems to be defenseless against fascist onslaughts.

The Integralists can now only exist as a "cultural society" and is under the threat of being dissolved even as such if it is discovered that they "air political problems" in their meetings. In fact, according to very recent reports in the American press, several leaders of the Integralistas were arrested.

Thus, it seems, Vargas proclaimed his dictatorship to prevent that of German-Italian make, which probably would be very much worse in its effects than the reestablished old South American "caudillo" system.

Does this lead to the conclusion that the only protection or prevention of a fascist dictatorship a la Hitler or Mussolini can only be a military dictatorship of the South American style or the beauties of the Stalinist workers' paradise?

Is there no choice in the future for those who claim to think with their own heads but between the concentration camps of Hitler and the forced labor camps in the Arctic?

It is clear that the road lies along more militant and aggressive proletarian anti-fascism of the kind which has shown its historic worth and efficacy in Spain.

*) See: *Greetings of the Executive Committee of the Communist International*, in December issue of: *The Communist International*, New York.

Labor in France

French capital, made overconfident by the passive acceptance of defeats by the General Confederation of Labor (C.G.T.) with its 5,000,000 members and by the major left-wing political parties of France, has begun a large scale frontal attack against labor. After feeling out the temper of the workers by sabotage of agreements made with them after the tremendous strike movement of July, 1936, they have decided that the moment for attack is ripe. By refusing to recognize workshop delegates or to arbitrate differences they have purposely stirred up the germs of social conflict. This offensive of the employers has a planned character, before which the opportunist tactics of the French labor union leaders, with their devotion to, and support of the Popular Front government, will hardly serve as a stumbling block.

On November 24 the General Confederation of French Employers met in 60 cities to "affirm their determination to maintain authority in all enterprises." Delegates from tens of thousands of industrial establishments were present at these meetings. Uniformly they struck the same notes: the high cost of living was caused by the workers' demands; arbitration did not consider the "poor" employer; the only rights remaining to the employer were paying the workers and taxes; closing factories would become necessary under such conditions. The "general interest" of the country demanded the end of such a state of affairs. A statement made at a meeting of the Metallurgical Employers several weeks previously that they were ready to go "to the point of insurrection" was reworded, and the various assemblies resolved on the central point of labor unionism, that the "control of hiring and firing, the first step towards workers' control, would be the end of the present regime."

To what extent the complaints registered by French capital are justified can be gathered from the profits gained by some of the large French establishments, *e.g.* below. (Profits are given in francs for years 1936-1937 and 1935-1936.)

Establishment	1936-37	1935-36
Electr-Cable	12,206,933	9,905,777
Compagnie General Industrielle.....	3,495,513	2,268,496
Bordelaise de Produits Chimiques	5,969,053	1,016,730
Mines de Bruay	21,999,374	20,368,766

These gains, compared with the losses suffered by the workers (see previous issue of Vanguard) is an eloquent testimonial to the insatiable desire for profits inherent in the capitalist class.

A reassertion of the traditional militancy of the French workers is the only method of countering the attack of the employers, of recouping the losses they have suffered and to make further gains. The threat of French capital of "insurrection" is no idle one and their assertion that control of hiring and firing would mean the end of the existing regime is fundamentally correct and constitutes a keen awareness of their class interests. The Cagoulard affair, in which a number of centers of arms deposits and reactionary headquarters was disclosed, is a token of fascist preparation. It is also a token of the nefarious behavior of the Popular Front government which was aware of these fascist preparations for a long period of time and did nothing towards putting a stop to these activities. But the mounting distrust of the French workers who knew of these activities which were going on almost openly, forced the government to rehabilitate itself before the eyes of the masses. So it "discovered" these arms centers about which it knew all along. A few of the small

fry were caught and the affair is now being hushed up. But the leaders in the whole affair go about preparing more extensively for future action. Tardieu, Laval, De Wendel and de Rothschild are left to continue their sinister machinations.

It is the increasing demand for direct action caused by the awareness of the duplicity of the government in which the workers placed their faith, which promises to overthrow the plans hatched by employers, the government and the union leaders. To recognize the employer as an enemy is not a difficult task for the class-conscious French worker. For the C.G.T. charter states that the C.G.T. has the two-fold purpose of fighting for everyday ameliorations and to "prepare for complete emancipation which can only be realized through the expropriation of capitalism." But syndicalist tactics have to a large extent been lost in recent years through use of political methods and governmental collaboration which syndicalism rejects. And it is this inner enemy which it is necessary to fight. That there are signs of such a fight is evident. The Communist Party of France, following the world-wide policy of the Russian government in laying out a program of class collaboration as a preparation for the coming war, represents the single most powerful enemy in this respect. And every defeat for the Communist Party in its policy of bowing to the French government and naturally to the capitalist enemy represents a victory for working-class militancy. It is the very aggressiveness of the Communist Party which makes it more culpable than the other reformist sections of the French working-class movement.

We might cite some examples of the mounting desire for syndicalist tactics: During the latter part of September the Congress of the Federation of Clothing Workers met. When it came to the election of officers two lists were presented, one by the Communists and the other by the rank and file which represented a program of militant syndicalist action. The Communist list was decisively defeated.

Amblard, one of the secretaries of the Union of Syndicates of the Paris region, complains that the union meetings are not to the taste of the reformist leaders where they encounter much opposition. Fleury and Marcel Paul of the Syndicate of Public services, both communists, were booed at a large public meeting. Heads of the Metal Workers (Paris) abstain from coming to meetings fearing the same treatment. The growing lack of confidence in the labor leaders fortunately is not giving way to pessimism. Rather the growing list of betrayers, leads to resentment. When 603 members of the Assembly have to vote on a war budget that amounts to 23 billion francs and 603 vote for the budget, then the workers believe their leaders are leading them to the slaughter. To prepare strikes, endorsed by a previous National Congress, as that of the Public Service called for Nov. 4; to prepare for it for weeks and then to call it off after a visit by Sec'y of the Interior, Dormoy, on Nov. 3, without any gains means destroying the confidence of the workers. The program of blowing hot and cold upon strikes, of bowing before the needs of the capitalist state machinery to the disadvantage of the workers, cannot succeed over a too long period without destroying either the leaders or the organization. One of the most outstanding acts of sabotage by the union leaders of a widespread strike movement to raise wages to meet the increased cost of living was that which occurred among the metal workers of the Paris region. It amounted to a national scandal. The employers were willing to grant a 6% increase which did not meet the workers needs and demands. The leaders forced by pressure from below prepared a strike of all workers in Paris. There is reason to believe that some of the zealous communists were taking advantage of the rebellious demands of the workers to use the strike as a political manipulation. It seemed that they were upbraided, being told the time was not ripe and so their policy of

sacrificing the workers' needs proceeded as it did. But they soon receded and called for a 24 hour strike which could not accomplish anything and those who opposed it were called weaklings by the communists, to whom it meant a safety valve for popular discontent. But they even reneged upon this action and instead called for a one hour strike. When it was urged by militants that to do so would destroy the workers confidence in themselves and their organization the critics were now labelled by the Communists, "leftists who wished to lead the Parisian workers in an adventure." That such tactics could only be of benefit to the bosses is proven by the lock-out which followed the one hour strike at Renault and Citroen, and against which the Syndicate of Metal Workers did not raise its voice.

It is such actions which give the employers confidence in the successful outcome of their attack against labor. For their greatest support is the capitulating Popular Front government supported by the C.G.T. leaders and the Socialist and Communist parties "of the working-class." Party allegiances are not easily dissolved but already the process is clearly discernible. The large and steady growth of the French anarchist movement is a powerful indication of the move towards direct action that the workers are undertaking, and this in spite of the powerful campaign of lies, abuse and calumny undertaken by the "vanguard of the proletariat" both against our French and Spanish comrades. The heroism and constructive and creative abilities of Spanish Anarcho-Syndicalism is taking root in the fertile soil of the French working class and against such a barrier the French capitalist class will strike in vain.

JACK WHITE

Reaction in Portugal

The Portuguese people is one of the most oppressed in the world. Many Lisbon workers are barefoot, in rags and starved, working for a mere 2.5 pesetas a day. Necessities here are much dearer than in Spain (before July 19th) so that the worker is infinitely worse off than his Spanish brother who earns the same. And this is in the best of cases, for there are thousands of unemployed who must either emigrate or join the army.

Those who do work must join the Corporative Syndicates, the Nazi-like labor front of the dictatorship. In the sections of the Syndicates are many agents of the International Police—Oliveira Salazar's "Gestapo"—which keeps close watch on the worker's output and on his social and private life. The police can enter a citizen's home at any hour. The discontented are escorted by this agency to the African colonies.

The Portuguese worker has shown many times that he is a revolutionist. There have been frequent attentats and uprisings drowned in blood. His instinctive fighting, directed against capitalism, has succeeded in undermining the army, navy, police, frontier guards and other forces set up by the dictator. The revolt of the naval units "Davo," "Douro" and "Albuquerque" in Lisbon and the aid given to the revolt by the garrisons of Coimbra, Braga and Castello-Branco testify to this growing revolutionary influence.

The position of the peasantry is not better. They are squeezed for contributions for the state and payments of rent to the large land owners. The country is covered with large country-seats and feudal estates of private "gentlemen" who call themselves nobles.

The dictatorship in Portugal has placed itself at the service of Franco in Spain. One of the most repugnant acts of the government was the inhuman delivery to Nationalist Spain of thousands of comrades who had sought refuge when their

homes had been invaded. Loyalist Spain has a representative in Lisbon, but the Spanish Embassy resembles a prison. However, the agents of Franco come and go freely. Scarcely had the Spanish emigration to Portugal begun, when the latter government prohibited its subjects from harboring Spaniards in their houses under penalty of 2000 escudos fine and stiff sentences of imprisonment. All refugees have been jailed as a measure of "public safety." Nevertheless, even now, there are hundreds of comrades being sheltered by Portuguese peasants who defy the authority of the dictatorship. No Spaniard may enter the country now who is not supplied with credentials issued by the Burgos Junta.

Salazar has also permitted the establishment of a radio transmitter by Franco agents in Portugal. The station daily broadcasts lies which only the dregs of humanity can tell. In short, the Spanish-Portuguese frontier has ceased to exist since the revolt broke out. Portugal today is merely the extension of the fascist rearguard.

Morocco

From behind the flood of propaganda concerning the recent disturbances in French Morocco the truth gradually emerges. These disturbances branded as the work of Mussolini and under which guise wholesale arrests were perpetrated and military control of civil life inaugurated, finds its origin in the Popular Front Government which is preparing the French colonies for war. Guided by Nogues, the French resident governor in Morocco, a series of brutal and provocative events have occurred, devoid of all sense even from a capitalist point of view. For his provocative actions, condoned by the government, can only serve to throw Moroccan sympathy towards Mussolini who profits from the French treatment of its colonies. French Morocco bids fair to become a second Spanish Morocco whose Moors would be used to overthrow the democratic framework.

An officer trained in militarism, a past master in the art of provocation at which all colonial officers are adept, M. Nogues personifies the stupidity of the French colonial policy. He has earned the undying hatred of the natives through diversion of the water supply from the city of Meknes; by allowing the Catholic invasion of the Berber city of Khemisset, by permitting the army to invade the mosques, by the mass arrests, by internment and banishment without trial, by shootings, by brutal proclamations, by the closing of the "university cities" such as at Fes, essentially a student city. A few quotations from the press of that country will give some indication of the disreputable caused by these brutal tactics.

Action Tunisienne, Arab journal of Tunis, on Nov. 13, asks:

"In the Mediterranean rivalry, which becomes more and more severe, do you think that the 80 airplanes at the Tunis airport will mean much if France is unable to count on the spontaneous support of the North African peoples?"

"Throughout Morocco repression rages and we know only that much of it which is given out. By the hundreds, the fellahs are sent to horrible prisons without permitting them to communicate with others. Tribes are raided as in the days of Charlemagne." (Gaston Delmas, secretary of the Socialist Federation of Morocco.) This statement appeared in the *Moroccan Socialist* and the number was seized by M. Nogues.

Comrade Driss Benzakour, Moroccan, member of the socialist section of Fes, figures among the hundreds arrested. Among other things he is charged with having served as interpreter to Maurice and Magdeleine Paz during their recent voyage to Morocco. Magdeleine Paz wrote in *POPULAIRE* French Socialist daily of Nov. 14:

"We cannot support the Administration in its pursuit of a policy not only inhuman, but not only iniquitous but absurd, insane and provocative." But we respectfully remark to Magdeleine Paz that the "Administration" which arrests a Moroccan socialist, guilty of having served as interpreter to the Colonial Commission of the Socialist Party, is under the orders of a government whose vice-president is the chief of the said Socialist Party.

ANGEL PESTANA

Angel Pestaña, one of the outstanding figures of the revolutionary movement of Spain, died in Barcelona on December 11, 1937 after a long and painful illness.

He was only forty-eight years of age and thirty years of his life was spent in service of the Spanish workers. From early youth he devotedly worked for the anarchist movement and rose to become one of its greatest personalities. He was one of the founders of the C.N.T. and its secretary for many years.

Pestaña was a watchmaker by trade and spent most of his life persecuted by hunger and governmental repression. Several times he was forced to flee Spain. During the horrible persecutions of the dictatorship of Martínez Anido in 1921, Pestaña was gravely wounded by the "pistoleros" who even tried to finish the job on him in the hospital where he had been taken. Though they did not succeed, there can be no doubt that these wounds hastened his premature end.

Even during the dictatorship of Primo de Rivera, Pestaña continued his job as organizer. Then came the Republic of April 14, 1931 and with it the reconstruction of the C.N.T. Pestaña still was the most popular figure of the movement. Unfortunately, differences arose between him and his followers—"the thirty"—on one hand, and the comrades of the F.A.I., on the other. Irreconcilable differences that forced his expulsion and the founding of his Syndicalist Party—a group which never attained any degree of importance. He was elected deputy to the Cortès from Cadiz, but his parliamentary influence was nil. Three months ago he rejoined the C.N.T.

In spite of his right turn, Pestaña remains one of the great figures of the Spanish as well as our International movement. He was a militant, courageous and heroic worker and for many years he was the living personification of the Revolutionary C.N.T.

ANARCHIST TACTICS IN SPAIN

(Continued from page four)

administrative, military, and financial center of the country. In many respects its position can be likened to that of Petrograd in 1917. Could the question of seizure of power be seriously posited in 1917 with the majority of Petrograd workers remaining under the control of the Mensheviks? For whatever pressure the elemental movement of workers and peasants of the central province of Spain exerted upon the Socialist Party in those revolutionary days it was still under the latter's tutelage. To go over the head of Caballero and his political apparatus was to go over the head of the majority of Madrid workers who supported him in those days, it was to attempt a dictatorship by a minority at the most critical moment when the enemy (Mola's army) was storming the gates of the city.

But the Socialist Party and the labor unions of the U.G.T. controlled by it were predominant not only in Castille but also in Asturias. They also possessed considerable strength in the province of Levante, which, though channelized along the lines

of revolutionary reconstruction by the economic leadership of the C.N.T., was still of sufficient importance to make its voice heard in the decisive days of the revolution of July 19. One must also take into consideration the Basque province, the most important source of raw materials and heavy industries, where the C.N.T. was the weakest and which would surely be thrown into the embrace of Mola's army had an extreme course been followed in the rest of Spain.

Not Even the Briefest Respite

All those factors would not have counted so much were the revolution given the briefest respite in order to work out its destinies. The logic of revolutionary developments would have brought about a considerable change in the attitude of the proletarian sector of the Socialist Party. The dissolution of the Central Government would be a matter of time only, during which the emerging organs of proletarian administration would acquire sufficient power to replace the apparatus of the old State. And as to the recalcitrant elements of the Socialist Party or the reorganized Communist Party, with its middle class orientation, they would be swept away by the pressure of revolutionary mass organizations—in the economic and political field—who would soon learn from experience that those elements are only hiding beneath their socialist or communist camouflage in order to carry on their counter-revolutionary work.

But the tragic uniqueness of the Spanish revolution consisted in the fact that no such respite was given to it. The revolution came as a sequel to the fascist revolt and war, for which it was utterly unprepared, and which was thrust upon it from the very first day. That placed upon the revolutionary forces, which in addition were far from controlling the strategic positions of financial, military and naval power, a terrific restraint, which only the irresponsible demagoguery of the inveterate haters of the anarchist movement can interpret as "deliberate class collaborationism."

Was Catalonia Self-Sufficient?

Yes, the anarcho-syndicalist movement was the dominant factor in Catalonia and a considerable part of Levante. Catalonia, however, was not a sovereign state, which means that it lacked its gold reserve and had no international status of its own. Apart from being dependent upon other provinces, and also France, for raw material necessary to keep its industries going, it was also exposed to attacks from the sea, which placed it in a position of dependence upon the so-called "democratic" powers. As it was reported in the "New York Post," it was the presence of British battleships in Barcelona waters in the July days that prevented the Italian cruisers from bombarding Barcelona.

But if Catalonia depended upon the rest of Spain, the latter likewise stood in great need of Catalonian industries during the first days of war. The breaking off of relationships between Catalonia and the rest of Spain would have been fatal for the anti-fascist cause at the time when Madrid was being attacked from the north and the Moorish legions were sweeping on toward Talavera and Toledo. Can anyone, who is not guided by the sole desire of scoring verbal points with a Union Square audience, ignore the immense complexity of the situation and blame everything on anarchist ideology and theory?

What if not sheer demagoguery is it to repeat this ignorant statement that the anarchists did not nationalize the banks because they lacked understanding of the urgent necessity of this measure? Every intelligent person knows that the gold reserves of the country were in Madrid and not in Catalonia, that the Catalonian banks lacked specie of their own, acting but as a clearing house for the Central Bank of Spain. Of

what particular value would be the nationalization of those financial institutions? They depended upon Madrid—in their foreign and domestic transactions—for credit. The shutting off of the latter would have forced an uncontrolled inflation upon the province which would not only throw its socialized economy out of gear but would automatically close the foreign markets. And if there was anything Catalonia could not afford, it was economic “self-sufficiency.” The Madrid politicians realized it too well: it was the threat of withdrawing credits that was used with such telling effect upon the C.N.T. organizations of Catalonia.

Korniloff Revolt Starting Point of Analogy

The entire situation dictating the course followed by the anarcho-syndicalist organizations can be best understood by comparing it not with the October revolution of 1917, with which it has much less in common than it is supposed, but with the August days of the Korniloff revolt projected into a possible revolutionary situation. What would have happened had the Korniloff revolt assumed a wider sweep and a more substantial foreign backing? We would have had in that case a situation quite closely resembling the one of the July revolution in Spain.

As is known, the revolutionary elements (Bolsheviks included) made a united front with the petty-bourgeois elements of the so-called Kerensky democracy. Had the struggle taken on a drawn out character, this united front would have been consolidated, with the revolutionary elements using it as an opening wedge for carrying out their social programs. But this program would have had to be carried out in cooperation with the petty-bourgeois parties, that is, the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionists who in turn would also have consolidated their position as a result of their role in fighting off the forces of the counter-revolutionary revolt. The possibility of such a cooperation with those parties, and even the acquiescence to their leading position was adumbrated by Lenin a month after the Korniloff revolt in his articles dealing with the problem of working out a compromise solution acceptable to the Mensheviks and the Social-Revolutionists.

Now the Prieto Socialists, Communists and the Republicans of the Company type are the Spanish equivalents of the Russian Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists. They are what Lenin called at that time the representatives of the petty-bourgeoisie and not the bourgeoisie. To read class collaboration and reformism into the very essence of anarchist theory on the basis of forced tactics of concessions to those parties, as Felix Morrow does in his article, is no more proper than to account for Lenin's advocacy of a compromise with the Mensheviks and Social-Revolutionists, or a policy of economic concessions to foreign capital, as alleged reformist roots of Lenin's theory.

Was There a Social Revolution in Spain?

It will be pointed out that Lenin advocated those political and economic concessions only upon condition of power passing into the hands of the Soviets. But the concessions made by the anarcho-syndicalists were conditioned upon the acceptance of a social revolution which far outstripped in its sweep and scope the original program laid down by Lenin. In this connection it is worthwhile to point out that the Trotskyites, quite in keeping with the petty sectarian spirit of their “vanguard” organization, have joined the conspiracy of silence in regard to the great achievements of the Catalonian revolution. They are very vociferous about the “crimes” and “betrayals” of the C.N.T. but one can find very little in their press upon the nature of the great revolution taking place under the leadership of the C.N.T.

“This is something—writes Robert Louzen, a non-sectarian Marxist, about this revolution, in the “La Revolution Proletarienne,” “which is not sufficiently known here, in France. (Due to the conspiracy of silence—S-X.) The social revolution, that is to say the expropriation of the bourgeoisie and the transfer of the means of production into the hands of the workers, has not only begun in Catalonia and the neighboring provinces but has nearly been achieved. . . . Almost everything has been collectivized and all that was achieved by the C.N.T. and is functioning under its control.”

That was accomplished within a comparatively short period, but to Felix Morrow this was a period during which “the basic crimes of the C.N.T. leadership were committed.” That is, according to our dialectician, while the C.N.T. was busy expropriating the bourgeoisie it was also “joining the bourgeois bloc in wiping out the revolution.” But how could it head the revolution and keep on wiping it out at the same time?

Or does Mr. Morrow seriously think that a decree allowing compensation to small factory owners constituted a “crime”? (For some reason Mr. Morrow does not tell his readers that this decree did not apply to big industry.) How much more criminal, then, from his point of view were Lenin and Trotsky in 1917-1918 who did not even deem expropriation a feasible program for the so-called workers' state. Every student of the Russian revolution knows that the program of the Communist Party at that period did not go beyond worker's control and that it was only after more than a half a year's struggle of the workers' organizations that the Soviet Government yielded on this question. The bourgeoisie retained ownership of factories and city dwellings (with the exception of a few houses sequestered for the use of revolutionary institutions) for quite a long time. And were it not for the general breakdown, the economic collapse, the universal sabotage on the part of the bourgeoisie, the program of expropriation would have had to wait more than seven or eight months for its realization. Certainly Lenin, who at that time in 1918 was very eager to obtain the cooperation of foreign capital for the economic rehabilitation of the country, (this was one of the issues on which Lenin was challenged by the left wing of the Communist Party headed at that time by Bukharin) did not consider the question of indemnity of crucial importance, at least not as important as Mr. Morrow who has no scruples in dubbing the slightest concession in this regard with no less an epithet than a “major crime.”

Concessions Not a Question of Revolutionary Ethics Pure and Simple

Altogether the question of concessions cannot be discussed apart from the concrete situation calling for such a policy. It is not a question of revolutionary ethics pure and simple. Was the turning over of Ukraine to German imperialism in 1918 a matter of revolutionary ethics pure and simple? Was the shipment of grain to the German army at the time when the cities of revolutionary Russia were decimated by hunger and starvation just a heinous crime against the revolution, against revolutionary democracy all over the world? Is Mr. Morrow prepared to view the humiliating conditions imposed upon Soviet Russia by triumphant German imperialism (and carried out, one must add, quite faithfully) as terrible pitfalls into which the Russian revolution stumbled quite willingly?

But certainly the situation in which revolutionary Catalonia found itself was no less tragic than that of Soviet Russia in 1918. Catalonia did not have any hinterland to fall back upon in case of defeat. Its rear was as much exposed as its front. Barcelona was in a much more dangerous position

than Petrograd in 1917-18 and there was no other revolutionary center to which to move in case of an attack from the sea or from the air.

And as to the most tragic factor of the situation—the lack of armaments—it is too well known to need any specific mention. Strangely enough, however, Mr. Morrow manages to ignore it altogether, as though the anarchist militia did not run into this tragic situation as soon as they approached Zaragoza, Huesca, Teruel. The problem loomed up in all its tragic, ominous urgency in the first week of August and not in October as Mr. Morrow wants us to believe by intimating that since Russian armaments did not arrive before October, the policy of concessions entered upon by the C.N.T. was not warranted.

True, Russia's aid dates from October, but the dickering and bargaining for concessions, the policy of blackmailing the revolutionary elements into yielding important strategic positions started much earlier. And it wasn't Russia only that exerted pressure in this direction. No one could foretell exactly the line followed by Blum's government in respect to shipment of armaments. But it is clear that the French government used this "argument" upon the Catalanian C.N.T. much before it fell in line with Downing Street.

International Isolation of C.N.T.

Added to that there was the tragic isolation of the anarchist movement in the international field. (In traducing the Spanish anarchist movement the Trotskyites contributed their modest share toward this isolation.) Let us not forget that the revolutionary course pursued by Lenin and Trotsky in 1917 was predicated upon the belief that the international proletariat (Germany included) would immediately respond to the October revolution in a very direct manner. Can the international situation of 1936 be compared with that of 1917? The proletariat of France and England remained nearly indifferent to the fate of the Spanish people. And as to Germany and Italy, the situation is too obvious to require any comment.

The situation, however, would have been much worse had the anarchists challenged the socialists and liberals in a more resolute manner. It is very slowly, with great difficulty, that the world is now shedding its deeply rooted prejudices about the anarchist movement. One can guess, however, the reaction of the liberal public opinion and of the international proletariat, which is now almost totally controlled by the right socialists and the Stalinists, to a resolute policy on the part of the Catalanian anarchists which would have involved them in a bitter, perhaps sanguinary struggle with Madrid at a time when Mola's army was battering its way towards its approaches. The ease with which the world's public opinion was swayed by the rudest sort of Stalinist campaign of slanders in conjunction with the May days in Barcelona may give us some idea of the total isolation of the anarchist movement in case of a more direct challenge of Madrid authorities backed up at that time by the U.G.T. and both wings of the Socialist Party.

All that does not mean that we have to subscribe to the entire policy pursued by the Spanish anarcho-sindicalist movement. A critical evaluation of this policy in the light of the accumulated experience of the last sixteen months, is on the order of the day. It is, however, a travesty of the very name of revolutionary criticism to approach the whole problem in the demagogic manner of the Trotskyite "critics"—and that is to ignore entirely the terrific pressure exerted upon the Spanish anarchists, to refuse to make any allowances for the specific factors of the historic setting against which the anarchists had to act.

And it is because Mr. Morrow fails to discuss the entire problem in its concrete historic setting that he has to fall

back upon obloquy and innuendo as his final arguments. For it is sheer slander to account for the "tactics" of the C.N.T. by the existence of a "corrupt, degenerate bureaucracy."

The argument lacks even the most elementary cogency. For if the tactics of the C.N.T. were the result of a process of a "bureaucratic degeneration" they would crystallize very slowly in keeping with the alleged permeation of the State apparatus with the "anarcho-sindicalist bureaucracy." But then Mr. Morrow assures us that the "original fall" of the C.N.T. took place in the first weeks of the revolution. What bureaucracy determined those crucial policies in that early period? The Durrutis? The hundred of militants like Oliver who stepped out of the prisons and concentration camps to throw themselves into the thick of the battle? Not even the professional traducers of the Stalinist outfit in Catalonia dare go as far as Mr. Morrow in their slanders of the C.N.T.

Were there any truth in Mr. Morrow's vilifications we should expect to find the "degenerate, corrupt bureaucracies of the C.N.T." upholding policies so dear to the bureaucracy as a class—and that is differentiation of salaries and unequal pay. Strangely enough, however, (that is to those who swallow Mr. Morrow's asseverations) the C.N.T., presumably dominated by its "bureaucrats" has raised itself as a veritable bulwark of opposition against any attempt to rob the workers of one of the chief conquests of the revolution—equal wages. It was the C.N.T. that initiated this policy,—which, as everyone knows, is the very negation of bureaucracy—and it is the C.N.T. that is fighting now tooth and nail the left handed attempts of the Communists and right socialists to do away with it in the name of "greater efficiency." (Russian style.)

Nor does the structure of the C.N.T. lend itself to bureaucratic degeneration. The federalist principles upon which it is based, the wide autonomy of its component organization, the lack of "apparatuses," "machines," without which no bureaucracy can exercise its control, the libertarian and genuinely democratic spirit of its membership,—all that render the domination of a bureaucracy nearly impossible.

The test thereof is the lack of bureaucracy in the long past of this organization which always had an extensive mass character. And the still greater proof is the intensely democratic, deeply popular spirit permeating its present activities. One has only to read of the numerous conventions, conferences held by the various component unions—peasants and workers—follow the free, unhampered flow of discussions, rank and file criticisms, to realize the full extent of this slanderous imputation of "bureaucratic degeneracy."

Without this deeply popular character the C.N.T. would not have been able to survive in the past. Nor would it have been able to withstand the terrific pressure exerted upon it by the hostile forces of the present government and international capitalism were it not for the fact that the C.N.T. came to express the deepest aspirations of the Spanish workers and peasants. Would a mere bureaucratic apparatus have been able to assert itself so powerful in face of the terrific odds against which the Spanish anarcho-sindicalist movement had to struggle?

Bureaucracy cannot be exorcised by glib formulas of correct leadership and scientific vanguards. It can be fought by blasting out the sources of its economic and political power. Economic inequality and political centralization are the basic roots of bureaucratic power. And it is rather strange to hear the Trotskyites, who uphold those two principles as the necessary prerequisites for the building of socialism, pointing an accusing finger at an organization which went further than any other labor organization in the world in its uncompromising struggle against economic inequality and centralization of power.

COMING EVENTS

JANUARY 28, 1938 - Mass meeting for Spain under the auspices of the United Libertarian organizations Friday night at 8:30 P.M. at the Libertarian Center, 229 Avenue "A" (near 14th St.,) N. Y. C. Speakers: F. Brandt, M. Olay, Jack Shannon, Sam Weiner and Jack White, chairman.

JANUARY 29th, 1938 Grand party at the Vanguard Hall, 22 W. 17th St., N. Y. C. for the benefit of the Stelton Anarchist Youth and the Vanguard Group. Dancing, music and refreshments. Admission 25c.

JANUARY 30, 1938—ATTENTION DETROIT: Tea Party (in new style), for the VANGUARD will take place Sunday evening, Jan. 30 at the Workmen Circle Hall Branch 111, 8545 12th Street, Detroit, Mich. Admission 25c. All friends and comrades welcome.

FEBRUARY 12th, 1938. The One Big Union Club and Equalitarian League is holding a Dance and Entertainment at the Irving Plaza Hall, Irving Pl. and 15th Street, N. Y. C. Tickets on sale at Rand School, Socialist Call, and Labor Book Shop.

FEBRUARY 19th, 1938. Dancing, entertainment for the bi-monthly paper "Spanish Revolution" given by the Vanguard Group at Vanguard Hall, 22 W. 17th St., N. Y. C. Dancing, entertainment and refreshments. Admission 35c.

February 26th—Attention LOS ANGELES: HOUSE PARTY for the benefit of the VANGUARD and SPANISH REVOLUTION will take place on Saturday night, February 26th, at the house of Mrs. Goldman, 2610 Ganahl Street, Los Angeles, Calif. Arranged by the Kropotkin Literary Society, Branch 413, Workmens Circle, given by friends: B. Cohen, Klein and Rigotty. All friends and comrades welcome.

Read Libertarian Literature

TRAGEDY OF SPAIN by Rudolf Rocker (48 pp.)—	.15
WHAT HAS BECOME OF THE RUSSIAN REVOLUTION (Authorized English Version) by M. Yvon (68 pp.)	.25
THE TRAGIC WEEK IN MAY by Augustine Souhy	.15
BOLSHEVISM: Promises and Realities, by G. Maximov	.10
NOW AND AFTER—A.B.C. of Communist- Anarchism, by Alexander Berkman (with a new introduction by Emma Goldman)	1.00
AFTER THE REVOLUTION by Santillan	1.00

Order from *Vanguard*, 45 W. 17th St., N. Y. C.

Special Rates for Bundles
For complete literature list write to VANGUARD

NOTICE TO READERS!

Owing to increased costs of printing, paper, etc. we will be compelled to raise the price of the *VANGUARD* in a few weeks. We urge you to take advantage of the present low rates of \$1.00 for 12 issues

Enclosed find \$1.00 for a year's subscription to *Vanguard*. send to:

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____

ANTI-FASCIST FREED

A four year fight against the deportation of Domenick Sallitto was terminated when attorneys in the case were notified by the Department of Labor that deportation warrant, proceedings and bond have been canceled.

Sallitto, who has been a legal resident of the United States for 16 years, was arrested by Department of Labor agents April 11, 1934, in Oakland, California, charged with being a member of an "organization believing in the overthrow of the government by force and violence" and ordered deported to Italy.

The nature of the charge being purely political, and the fact that Sallitto would have been subject to either long imprisonment or possible death if deported to Italy—because of his outstanding anti-fascist sentiments, aroused a nation-wide protest. The Ferrero-Sallitto Defense conference states that an estimate of 40,000 individual protests and the collective protests of over 800 Trade Unions and liberal organizations aggregating a membership of approximately more than 500,000, have been sent to the Department of Labor.

Vincent Ferrero, who was arrested with Sallitto on similar charges, is now at liberty under a \$1000 bail, pending the outcome of a private Bill in his behalf, introduced in Congress by Representative Celler of Brooklyn.

Let's Organize More Groups

There has lately been a considerable expansion of the sphere of influence of the libertarian philosophy in the United States. Now is the time for a consolidation of our forces so that they may be utilized to the fullest possible extent. Not only should our English-speaking groups carry on membership drives; they should assist in the formation of new groups or nuclei in cities where no such groups exist. An organization can do more than scattered individual comrades even if the group contains but a few members. A well knit nucleus can, by judicious planning utilize any gains made by the propaganda and educational activities it carries on, for gains of a more permanent nature.

To put our libertarian ideas into practice the diffused interest in anarchism must be channelized into organized form at a much more rapid rate than is being done at present. With this in view, the Vanguard Group has elected a special committee for the purpose of giving whatever aid we can in the formation of new groups. This committee has already begun its work and is anxious to correspond with all comrades and groups who wish to cooperate in this endeavor. Moreover, we plan to send several organizers on tour of the New England states within the next month. If you wish to have your town or locality included in the itinerary, please communicate with us at once.

Since the tour will require finances we are raising a special fund for this purpose. You can help immeasurably by contributing to this fund. Please address all communications to: Organizing Committee. Vanguard, 45 West 17th St., New York, N. Y.

Because space does not permit, the *Vanguard* is unable to print a great deal of the news which arrives from Spain. We refer our readers to the *Spanish Revolution*, published twice a month at 45 W. 17th St., New York, N. Y. Subscription \$1.00 per year.

The Spanish Labor Press Bureau, 170 Fifth Ave., New York City, publishes an excellent news bulletin containing facts on the struggle in Spain.